

THERMODYNAMICS OF COHERENT STATES AND BLACK HOLE ENTROPY

A.G.Bashkirov¹

Institute for Dynamics of Geospheres RAS, Leninskii prosp. 38 (bldg.6),
117334, Moscow, Russia

A.D.Sukhanov

Peoples Friendship University of Russia, ul. Miklukho-Maklaya 8, 117198,
Moscow, Russia

Abstract

Entropy and temperature of a system in a coherent state are naturally defined on a base of a density matrix of the system. As an example, entropy and temperature are evaluated for coherent states of a harmonic oscillator and quantum field described by the Klein–Gordon–Fock equation with a source term. It is shown, in particular, that the temperature of the coherent oscillator in a ground state coincides with the effective temperature of a harmonic oscillator being in contact with a heat bath (Bloch formula) when the bath temperature tends to zero. The Bekenstein–Hawking entropy of a black hole can also be interpreted as an entropy of coherent states of a physical vacuum in the vicinity of a horizon surface.

PACS: 03.65.-w, 05.70.Ln, 05.40.+j, 04.70.-Dy, 97.60.L

Keywords: Entropy and temperature of coherent states; Harmonic oscillator; Klein–Gordon–Fock field; Bekenstein–Hawking entropy.

1 Introduction

Considerable recent attention has been focused on coherent states in the context of a new non–Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics in which the crucial point is an interaction of the system with its surrounding. During the interaction process the most of states of the open quantum system becomes unstable, and, as a result, an arbitrary state of this system becomes a superposition of "selected states" that provides classical description. This phenomenon has come to be known as a decoherence.

An intrinsic connection between the decoherence phenomena and coherent states of a system was suggested in [1]. Moreover, it was noted [1] that decoherence might produce coherent states. This was proved for particular case of a system of harmonic oscillators in [2]. Analyzing a master equation for an open quantum system interacting with a thermostat Paz and Zurek [3] found that the coherent states were sampled as "selected states", when self–energy of the system was of the same order as an energy of its interaction with the thermostat.

This process is accompanied by the increase of both the open system entropy and the thermostat entropy due to losing information about their states. If a total closed system was initially in a pure state (with the zero entropy) then the theorem states [4–6] that the entropies produced in the open system and thermostat are equal.

At first glance there is a paradox of non-zero entropy and temperature of a coherent state which is a pure state. In our opinion, it is resolved by the fact that the coherent state

¹Corresponding author.

E-mail address: abas@idg.chph.ras.ru (A.G.Bashkirov)

is an eigenstate of non-Hermitian operator and hence values of observable variables remain indetermined in the coherent state, among them an energy. Thus, it is found to be fruitful to consider a density matrix of the coherent state and determine entropy and temperature with the use of standard methods of statistical physics.

Such a concept will be illustrated below (in Sec.2) by the examples of well-known coherent states of open quantum systems, namely, a quantum harmonic oscillator and quantum scalar field in a vicinity of a static source.

This approach provides also fresh insight (in Sec.3) into the problem of the black hole entropy.

2 Entropy of coherent states

The known isomorphism of Hilbert spaces of states of arbitrary quantum systems ensures that a space of states of any n -dimensional quantum system can be mapped on the space of states of n -dimensional harmonic oscillator. Owing to this fact, properties of particular model systems discussed below may be considered as sufficiently general.

For purposes of clarity we begin with the simplest system, that is the one-dimensional quantum harmonic oscillator. In our approach the oscillator in a coherent state is treated as an open system in a steady interaction with an external force center (e.g. atomic nucleus). The interaction with internal variables of the force center could ensure a modification of the Shrödinger equation such that it describes the decoherence of a harmonic oscillator and the passage of its state into a coherent state. Here, however we will confine our discussion to a prepared coherent oscillator state.

The Hamiltonian of the system is

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}(p^2 + m^2\omega^2q^2), \quad (1)$$

where p, q are respective momentum and coordinate operators satisfying the commutation relation $[q, p] = i\hbar$. Coherent states are conveniently [7] discussed in terms of non-Hermitian creation and annihilation operators

$$a = \frac{m\omega q + ip}{(2m\hbar\omega)^{1/2}}, \quad a^\dagger = \frac{m\omega q - ip}{(2m\hbar\omega)^{1/2}}, \quad (2)$$

satisfying the commutation relations $[a, a] = [a^\dagger, a^\dagger] = 0$, $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$. A coherent state can be defined as an eigenstate of the non-Hermitian operator a :

$$a|d\rangle = \left(\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}\right)^{1/2} d|d\rangle. \quad (3)$$

where the eigenvalue d is a complex number.

The density matrix of the d -coherent state is $\rho^d = |d\rangle\langle d|$. To construct a thermodynamics of this state we need in a partition function of ρ^d . Since it is defined as a value ensuring the condition $\text{Sp}[\rho^d] = 1$, we consider only diagonal elements of ρ^d . Inasmuch as coherent states are not mutually orthogonal, we get in a coherent state representation

$$\rho_{ff}^d = |\langle f|d\rangle|^2 = \exp\left\{-\frac{m\omega|d|^2}{2\hbar}\right\} \exp\left\{\frac{m\omega}{2\hbar}(-|f|^2 + d^*f + f^*d)\right\}. \quad (4)$$

The first multiplier doesn't depend on the index f and thus it can be considered as a normalizing factor, that is, a reverse value of the partition function

$$Q_{osc}^d = e^{\bar{n}_d}. \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{n}_d = m\omega|d|^2/(2\hbar)$ is the mean number of quanta in the state d .

Considering that an energy representation is the most used in statistical mechanics, we demonstrate the same result in this representation:

$$\rho_{nn}^d = |\langle n|d\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{n!}|\langle 0|a^n|d\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{n!}\bar{n}_d^n|\langle 0|d\rangle|^2,$$

where the equation (3) and property $|n\rangle = (a^\dagger)^n|0\rangle/\sqrt{n!}$ are used. The partition function $Q_{osc}^d = |\langle 0|d\rangle|^{-2}$ is determined with the use of a condition of completeness of the set $|n\rangle$, that is $\text{Sp}[\rho^d] = \sum_n |\langle n|d\rangle|^2 = 1$, whence we get (5).

For the mean energy of the coherent $|d\rangle$ -state of the oscillator we have

$$E_{osc}^d = \langle d|H|d\rangle = \sum_n \rho_{nn}^d \langle n|H|n\rangle = \hbar\omega(\bar{n}_d + \frac{1}{2}). \quad (6)$$

According to one of basic principles of the statistical mechanics, all thermodynamic properties of a system can be found when the partition function Q is known. Really, in general, a characteristic thermodynamic function F is defined as

$$F = -k_B T \ln Q \quad (7)$$

and known as the Helmholtz free energy $F(T, V, N)$ for a canonical ensemble, or thermodynamic potential $J(T, V, \mu)$ for grand canonical ensemble, or Gibbs free energy $G(T, p, N)$ for $T - p$ ensemble. A thermodynamic entropy is defined as

$$S = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial T}. \quad (8)$$

The energy E is connected with the free energy F via the Gibbs–Helmholtz relation

$$E = F + TS. \quad (9)$$

Thermodynamics of the $|d\rangle$ -state of the oscillator is constructed in the same manner on the base of the partition function Q_{osc}^d :

$$F_{osc}^d = -k_B T_{osc} \bar{n}_d, \quad S_{osc}^d = k_B \bar{n}_d + k_B T_{osc} \frac{\partial \bar{n}_d}{\partial T_{osc}}, \quad (10)$$

$$E_{osc}^d = k_B T_{osc}^2 \frac{\partial \bar{n}_d}{\partial T_{osc}}. \quad (11)$$

Equations (6) and (11) are used here for a self-consistent definition of the effective temperature of the coherent state, in contrast to common thermodynamics where the temperature is the known parameter of a system state.

From the equations (6) and (11) we get

$$\hbar\omega(\bar{n}_d + \frac{1}{2}) = k_B T_{osc}^2 \frac{\partial \bar{n}_d}{\partial T_{osc}}. \quad (12)$$

Representing ω as $\omega = \alpha \bar{n}_d$, where $\alpha = 2\hbar/(m|d|^2)$, we can consider (12) as a differential equation for T_{osc} , that is

$$\hbar \alpha \bar{n}_d (\bar{n}_d + \frac{1}{2}) \frac{\partial T_{osc}}{\partial \bar{n}_d} = k_B T_{osc}^2. \quad (13)$$

Its solution is

$$T_{osc} = \frac{\hbar \omega}{2k_B \bar{n}_d \ln(1 + \frac{1}{2\bar{n}_d})}, \quad T_{osc}|_{\bar{n}_d \gg 1/2} = \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B}. \quad (14)$$

We can introduce an area $A_d = \pi|d|^2$ of a phase portrait (circle) of the corresponding classical oscillator in $(q, p/\omega)$ - phase plane, since $\langle q(t) \rangle_d = d \cos \omega t$ and $\langle p(t) \rangle_d = -d\omega \sin \omega t$. Then, $\bar{n}_d$ and the entropy of the coherent state are found as

$$\bar{n}_d = \frac{k_B T_{osc} m A_d}{2\pi \hbar^2} = \frac{A_d}{2\pi l_0^2} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{osc}^d = 2k_B \bar{n}_d = k_B \frac{A_d}{\pi l_0^2}, \quad (15)$$

where $l_0 = \sqrt{\hbar/(m\omega)}$ is the amplitude of zero-point oscillations.

Thus, the entropy and temperature do not vanish even for a dynamical quantum system in the coherent state, because the weights of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian H are not deterministic in the state.

In the opposite limit case $\bar{n} = 0$ we have $E_{osc}^0 = \hbar\omega/2$ and $F_{osc}^0 = 0$. In this case an effective temperature T_{osc}^0 of zero-point oscillations can be found with the use of the well-known Bloch formula (see, e.g. [8]) for a probability distribution $b(q)$ for a harmonic oscillator interacting with a heat bath of a temperature T_{hb} :

$$b(q) = \sqrt{\frac{m\omega^2}{2\pi k_B T_{Bl}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{m\omega^2 q^2}{2k_B T_{Bl}} \right\}, \quad T_{Bl} = \frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_B} \coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_B T_{hb}}. \quad (16)$$

At very low temperature of the heat bath, $k_B T_{hb} \ll \hbar\omega$, we get $T_{Bl} = T_{osc}^0 \equiv \hbar\omega/(2k_B)$. The temperature T_{osc}^0 does not depend on T_{hb} and determined by zero-point fluctuations entirely. The corresponding entropy is determined with the use of the first of eq.(9) as $S_{osc}^0 = k_B$.

We now consider another example of an open quantum system, the scalar field $\phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ described by the Klein–Gordon–Fock (KGF) equation with a static source term in the right hand side,

$$\left(\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \nabla^2 + \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} \right) \phi(\mathbf{r}, t) = g \varrho(\mathbf{r}). \quad (17)$$

The density $\varrho(\mathbf{r})$ and intensity g of the source are given and fixed, which is natural if we treat (17) as a pure field problem and consider only processes outside the source. On the other hand, such a problem setting is an idealization because we disregard all processes that occur inside the source which is a real extended physical system. As in the previous example, we restrict the discussion by the supposing that these internal processes provide formatting of a coherent state of the field and will consider the field $\phi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ in the resulted coherent state.

The equation (17) has been analyzed in detail in quantum field theory (see, e.g. [9]). In particular it was shown that with non-Hermitian operators $a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ similar to operators (2), coherent states of the physical vacuum are eigenstates of the operators $a_{\mathbf{k}}$.

The well-known solution for the Klein–Gordon–Fock equation with a static source term determines the probability to find a given number of quanta in the vacuum disregarding

their moments. This probability is governed by the Poisson distribution

$$\rho_{nn} = Q_{KGF}^{-1} \frac{\bar{n}^n}{n!}, \quad n = \sum_i n_{\mathbf{k}_i}. \quad (18)$$

Hence we led to the same relations which were introduced above for the particular case of the harmonic oscillator. The partition function and entropy of this ensemble are

$$Q_{KGF} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{n}^n}{n!} = e^{\bar{n}}, \quad F_{KGF} = -k_B T_{KGF} \bar{n}, \quad S_{KGF} = 2k_B \bar{n}. \quad (19)$$

An energy of virtual quanta is presented as the sum of energies of harmonic oscillators of the frequencies ω_i and mean occupation numbers $\bar{n}_{\mathbf{k}_i}$:

$$E_{KGF} = \bar{n} \hbar \bar{\omega} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \bar{\omega}, \quad (20)$$

where $\bar{\omega} = \sum_i \omega_i \bar{n}_{\mathbf{k}_i} / \bar{n}$ is the mean frequency. Then, we find the thermodynamic temperature of the field for the limit case $\bar{n} \gg 1/2$ as

$$T_{KGF} = \frac{\hbar \bar{\omega}}{k_B}. \quad (21)$$

Here, as in the previous example, the coherent state temperature is determined by the system properties and can not be decreased without destroying the coherent state.

To estimate $\bar{n}$, we consider the expectation value of the field potential of a spherical source of radius d , which can be represented [9] in the ground state as

$$\langle 0 | \phi(\mathbf{r}) | 0 \rangle_{|r>d} = g \int d^3 r' \frac{e^{-|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|/\lambda_C}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|} \varrho(r'), \quad (22)$$

where $\lambda_C = \hbar/(mc)$ is the Compton radius.

Equation (22) implies that a cloud of virtual quanta envelops the source by a spherical layer of thickness λ_C , which do not depend on a size of the source. Therefore, $\bar{n}$ must be proportional to the volume of the layer $\lambda_C A_d$ (here $A_d = 4\pi d^2$ is the area of the layer surface and it is supposed that $d \gg \lambda_C$), divided by the quantum volume element $\sim \lambda_C^3$:

$$\bar{n} \sim \frac{A_d}{\lambda_C^2}. \quad (23)$$

Entropy (21) then becomes

$$S_{KGF} \sim k_B \frac{A_d}{\lambda_C^2}. \quad (24)$$

An important fact is that entropy (24) is proportional to the source surface area (cf. the equation (15) for the harmonic oscillator). We have such a dependence because the entropy results from stochastic processes occurring in the vacuum near the surface of contact with the source. The contribution from the source itself into the entropy of the total system is not taken into account in accordance with the initial statement of the problem.

3 Black hole entropy

The entropy S_{BH} of a black hole is

$$S_{BH} = k_B \frac{A_{BH}}{4\lambda_P^2}, \quad (25)$$

where $A_{BH} = 16\pi G^2 M_{BH}^2 / c^4$ is the horizon area, $\lambda_P = (\hbar G / c^3)^{1/2}$ Planck length and M_{BH} black hole mass. The entropy S_{BH} in the form (25) was firstly found by Bekenstein [10,11] and Hawking [12] using purely thermodynamic arguments based on first and second laws of thermodynamics.

It is evident that the entropy (25) of a black hole S_{BH} is of the same form as the equation (24). The proportionality of the entropy to the surface area of a black hole seemed paradoxical over a long time. This paradox was mostly resolved in [13,14], where the contribution to S_{BH} coming only from virtual quantum modes which propagate in the immediate vicinity of the horizon surface was calculated. However, an ambiguity remains in the procedure for selecting such modes and we therefore think that the problem of justifying the expression (25) from the standpoint of statistical mechanics is still open, which results in an uninterrupted flow of papers on the subject.

In this respect the recent review paper by Bekenstein [15] is worth mentioning, where a model quantization of the horizon area was proposed in the section with the ambitious title "Demystifying black hole's entropy proportionality to area". There the horizon is formed by patches of equal area $\alpha\lambda_P^2$ which get added one at a time. Since the patches are all equivalent, each will have the same number of quantum states, say, κ . Therefore, the total number of quantum states of the horizon is

$$Q_{BH} = \kappa^{A_{BH}/(\alpha\lambda_P^2)}. \quad (26)$$

In essence Bekenstein considers his model construction as a microcanonical ensemble for the patches. As a result, he treats Q_{BH} as the thermodynamic weight of the system and defines the entropy of the horizon as the statistical (Boltzmann's) entropy for the microcanonical ensemble

$$S_{BH}^B = k_B \ln Q_{BH}. \quad (27)$$

To ensure that this equation would result in the desired thermodynamic expression (25) Bekenstein puts

$$\alpha = \beta \ln \kappa \quad (28)$$

and chooses $\beta = 4$.

It should be noted here that substituting equation (28) for α into the starting equation (26) immediately results (because $\kappa^{1/\ln \kappa} = e$) in the familiar to us form (see (5), (19)) of the partition function of the coherent state

$$Q_{BH} = e^{\bar{n}}, \quad \bar{n} = A_{BH}/(\beta\lambda_P^2), \quad (29)$$

The Boltzmann's formula (27) for black hole entropy follows from here if the thermodynamic definition of the entropy (8) is used under condition that $\bar{n}$ does not depend on T_{BH} and the partition function is regarded as the thermodynamic weight and $\beta = 4$. Alternatively, if $\bar{n} \propto T_{BH}$ we are to depart from (27) and put $\beta = 8$ to ensure arriving to the equation (25) from the definition (8).

Thus, we see that the partition function, mean number of quanta and entropy of a black hole are of the same forms as the relevant values for coherent states of the harmonic oscillator or quantum field in a vicinity of the static source.

On the other hand it was found [16,17] that a strong gravitational field provides a decoherence of a system placed in the domain of this field. It is therefore quite natural to expect that a coherent state of virtual excitations is formed in a vicinity of the black hole and, as a result, the black hole's entropy is the thermodynamic entropy of this coherent state. On behalf of such assumption we can point to great unsolved problems in deriving the thermodynamic black hole's entropy (25) with the use of the standard Gibbs' equilibrium statistical ensemble and the von Neumann formula for the entropy. Some years ago one could even read the assertion: "...it has been shown that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy does not coincide with the statistical-mechanical entropy $S^{SM} = -\text{Tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$ of a black hole" [18]. This point of view gained acceptance in recent years. In support of this assertion we present yet another quotation: "there are strong hints from black hole thermodynamics that even our present understanding of the meaning of the "ordinary entropy" of matter is inadequate" [19].

It is a pleasure to acknowledge fruitful discussions with our associates Dr. A. Vityazev.

References

- [1] Zurek W.H., Habib S., Paz J.P. Phys.Rev.Lett. 70, (1993) 1187–1190.
- [2] Tegmark M., Shapiro H.S. Phys.Rev. E50, (1994) 2538–2547.
- [3] Paz J.P., Zurek W.H. Quantum limit of decoherence: environment induces superselection of energy eigenstates. qu-ph/9811026 (1998).
- [4] Page D.N. Phys.Rev.Lett. 71, (1993) 1291–1294.
- [5] Elze H.-T., Open quantum systems, entropy and chaos. qu-ph/9710063 (1997).
- [6] Kay B.S., Entropy defined, entropy encrease and decoherence understood, and some black-hole puzzles solved. hep-th/9802172 (1998).
- [7] Messiah A. Quantum Mechanics, vol.1, North-Holland Publ. Comp., Amsterdam, 1961.
- [8] Landau L.D., Lifshitz E.M. Statistical Physics, Pergamon Press, London, 1958.
- [9] Henley E.M., Thirring W. Elementary Quantum Field Theory, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1962.
- [10] Bekenstein J.D. Lett.Nuovo Cimento 4, (1972) 737.
- [11] Bekenstein J.D. Phys.Rev. D7, (1973) 2333.
- [12] Hawking S.W. Commun. Math. Phys., 43, (1975) 199 .
- [13] Frolov V., Novikov I. Phys.Rev. D 48, (1993) 4545 .
- [14] Frolov V. Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, (1995) 3319.
- [15] Bekenstein J.D. Quantum black holes as atoms. gr-qc/9710076 (1997).
- [16] Hawking S.W. Commun. Math. Phys., 87, (1982) 395 .
- [17] Ellis J., Mohanty S., Nanopoulos D.V. Phys.Lett. B, v.221, (1989) 113–117.
- [18] Frolov V. hep-th/9412211 (1994).
- [19] Wald R.M. Class.Quant.Grav. 16, (1999) A177; gr-qc/9901033